The RECONSTRUCTIONIST

VOL. XIV. MARCH 5, 1948 I ADAR 24, 5707 No. 2

- *AN OPEN LETTER TO LESSING ROSENWALD—(Editorial)*
- *A RABBI "IN WHITE"*
  by Israel J. Gerber
- *WHEN SHOULD THE TORAH BE READ IN THE SYNAGOGUE?*
  by Max Weine
- *A FALSE PORTRAIT: THE JEW IN FICTION*
  By Harold U. Ribalow

Dedicated to the advancement of Judaism as a religious civilization, to the upbuilding of Israel's ancient homeland, and to the furtherance of universal freedom, justice and peace.

the Reconstructionist

is published bi-weekly for twenty consecutive issues, starting in October, by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, Inc., 15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y. Subscription $3.00 per year; 15¢ per copy; foreign 25¢ extra; membership in the Foundationn, $5.00 per year, including subscription to *The Reconstructionist*. Reentered as second class matter October 3, 1935, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITORIAL BOARD:
Chairman: **Mordecai M. Kaplan**
Associate Chairman: **Ira Eisenstein**
Managing Editor: **Eugene Kohn**

Associate Editors: **Israel S. Chipkin, Judith K. Eisenstein, Theodore Friedman, Roland B. Gittelsohn, Jacob S. Golub, Emanuel Green, Bernard Heller, Will Herberg, Aharon Kessler, Immanuel Lewy, Edward T. Sandrow, Leo Shapiro, Milton Steinberg, Bernard Weinryb, Max Wiener.**

Contributing Editors: **Morris Adler, Michael Alper, Nathan A. Barack, Morton M. Berman, Philip S. Bernstein, Asher Block, Samuel M. Blumenfied, Ben-Zion Bokser, William J. Boxerman, Jack J. Cohen, Mortimer J. Cohen, Lawrence W. Crohn, Samuel Dinin, Harry Essrig, Emanuel Gamoran, Judah I. Goldin, Solomon Goldman, Robert Gordis, Samuel C. Kohs, Milton Konvitz, Myer S. Kripke, Louis M. Levitsky, Theodore N. Lewis, Joshua Loth Liebman, Sidney Morgenbesser, Maurice Pekarsky, David Polish, Joshua Trachtenberg, Leo Trepp. Max Weine, Jacob J. Weinstein.**

Executive Secretary: **Hannah L. Goldberg**

AMONG OUR CONTRIBUTORS

ISRAEL J. GERBER is rabbi of Congregation Agudath Achim, Fitchburg, Mass.

HAROLD U. RIBALOW is a well known journalist and former managing editor of *Congress Weekly*. He is now associated with the *New Palestine*.

MAX WEINE is rabbi of Congregation Beth Israel, Camden, N. J., and a contributing editor to the RECONSTRUCTIONIST.

We express our gratitude to Lionel Reiss, the noted artist, who designed the new cover for the Reconstructionist.

The Editorial Board of the Reconstructionist.

THE FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN JEW

By MORDECAI M. KAPLAN

A deeply searching interpretation of modern American Judaism and a guide to the future of the Jewish people.

Part I The Resurrection of a People
Part II The Next Stage in Jewish Religion
Part III Toward a New Pattern for Jewish Life

$6.00 per copy

Please Order From

JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION, Inc.,
15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y.

Please send me ..... copies of THE FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN Jew.

Check for ..... is enclosed.

Name .....

Address .....

The RECONSTRUCTIONIST

Vol. XIV. March 5, 1948 I Adar 24, 5707 No. 2

EDITORIALS

AN OPEN LETTER TO LESSING ROSENWALD

Dear Mr. Rosenwald:

We are replying editorially to your letter, which appears elsewhere in this issue,* because others beside yourself are probably troubled by the question of dual loyalties which it raises, and we want to set you and them right.

We are sorry if the editorial to which your letter refers caused you unnecessary pain. We concede that the mere fact that statements made before the American Council for Judaism, could, if lifted out of their context, be used by anti-Semites against all Jews is not ground enough to condemn those statements. They seem to us, however, even *in* their context, to have dangerous implications, and, in these critical days, it is of more than usual importance to heed the injunction of the rabbis: "Sages, be cautious in your utterances."

Perhaps we gave vent too freely to our exasperation with the policy of the American Council for Judaism. If so, we gladly offer our apology.

We believe, however, that you want more than that. You are sincerely troubled by the problem of dual loyalties. You challenge us and all Zionists, in effect, to renounce all interest in the future Jewish state, once it comes into being. You admit that Jews owe a loyalty to Jewry as a body of coreligionists, but you feel that any possible conflict between our interests as Jews and our interests as Americans must be avoided. You would, therefore, have American Jews accept the tenet that they should consider themselves merely "Americans of the Jewish faith."

We could consent to that formula, if, under the term *faith,* you included all of those beliefs that Jews entertain with regard to the future of mankind, the role of the Jewish people in helping mankind to fulfil its destiny, and the personal obligations imposed by these beliefs on the individual Jew. But you must realize that, on all these subjects, there is considerable diversity of opinion among Jews. Obviously your formula, to be valid, should take cognizance of the religious beliefs of Orthodox, Conservative and Reform Jews, and also of those Jewish humanists whose faith does not fit into any of the more common denominational formulations of Jewish belief. For us Zionists, for example, the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people is an essential element of our faith. We deem

* See page 23.

the upbuilding of the national home in Eretz Yisrael to be necessary in order to enable Judaism as a religious civilization to make its best contribution to the spiritual development of mankind. Your error does not lie in assuming that the only bond between the American Jew and Eretz Yisrael must be a spiritual one; it lies in assuming that, because Zion plays a minor role, if any, in the version of Jewish religion with which you were indoctrinated, it need play no part in the faith of other Jews. You seem to regard their professed spiritual loyalty to the Jewish people and its homeland as mere camouflage for a secular chauvinist nationalism.

What actually is this problem of dual loyalty? Surely you do not maintain, Mr. Rosenwald, that the mere co-existence of a Jewish state and an American state necessitates their mutual antagonism. On the contrary, since the United States is a member of the United Nations, and since the United Nations has committed itself in favor of a Jewish state in a part of Palestine, the likelihood of a conflict between the Jewish state and America is remote.

Nevertheless, it is conceivable. You want, therefore, to know how Zionists would act in the event of war between America and the Jewish state.

The answer is that they would act in accordance with their exclusive political allegiance to America, just as if some other state than a Jewish one were involved, just as Jews have fought against Jews in other wars, just as American Catholics would fight if the United States were at war with a Catholic country.

That does not mean that there might be no conscientious objectors among Jews. But their objection would be specifically *on grounds of faith,* for every war poses a spiritual dilemma to people who are religiously devoted to the cause of peace. Their spiritual conflict would, therefore, not be resolved by their considering themselves "Americans of Jewish faith." But Zionism has never claimed an obligation for Jews in the Diaspora to fight at the call of the future Jewish state and has always assumed that the obligation of Jews to give patriotic wartime service to the countries in which they live was no different from that of their Gentile fellow-citizens.

What we have here said should satisfy you that Zionism—not only now, but equally after the establishment of the Jewish state—involves no disloyalty to America. Zionism is a democratic movement for the self-emancipation of the Jewish people and the advancement of Jewish civilization. It in no way partakes of that aggressive totalitarian nationalism which is the bane of modern society and the principal obstacle to world peace. But, without wishing to be offensive, we must state, in the interest of candor, that the kind of Americanism which you espouse does smack strongly of such dangerous totalitarianism.

You claim, in your address to the convention of the Council, that true Americanism demands "an awesome conviction that *here*—in the United States of America, and *nowhere else in the world,* I will live, here I will die, and so with my descendants." (Italics yours.) That virtually denies the right of expatriation, a right which totalitarian governments have denied but which democratic governments have always affirmed. Nobody questions your right to continue living in America, but what moral justification have you for binding your posterity to such a pledge to the end of time? And what right have you to expect all Americans to bind themselves similarly? If your ancestors, and the ancestors of all other Americans, except the American Indians, were to have had that kind of loyalty to the lands in

which they lived, there would have been no United States of America.

And what would you say, Mr. Rosenwald, of the Christian missionaries who choose to live in remote parts of the globe rather than on American soil? Are all of them unpatriotic? And what do you think of such personalities as Henrietta Szold or Judah L. Magnes, who, responding to the call of opportunity to do a noble piece of work for Israel and mankind, left America and settled in Eretz Yisrael? Were they disloyal to America? Have not people like these been carrying the spirit of our American civilization into Palestine and other countries in a way that reflects honor on America? And cannot the same be said of the humble and unsung American *halutz,* who, seeing in the upbuilding of Eretz Yisrael an opportunity to fulfill himself as a Jew and as a human being chooses to emigrate to Eretz Yisrael?

Or even take the case, Mr. Rosenwald, of the American Jew who settles in the land from other than idealistic motives. Suppose that, because of anti-Jewish discrimination which he encounters in America, he decides to settle in the one country in which he knows he will not be discriminated against because of his Jewishness. Is he to be condemned for acting in accordance with his "inalienable right" to "the pursuit of happiness"?

You see, Mr. Rosenwald, the point to which our discussion has led. It all adds up to this: not Zionism and not the recognition of spiritual loyalty to the legitimate interests of a Jewish state are either un-American or irreligious. Rather is your attitude of asking American Jews to renounce interest in any other country than America (forgive us if our candor hurts you) both irreligious and un-American. It is irreligious, because, from a religious viewpoint, the whole earth is God's, and the opportunity of serving Him does not stop at any territorial limits. Men must be free to live their lives wherever and however they can best experience life as worthwhile, in accordance with the dictates of their own conscience. Your attitude strikes us as un-American, because it is undemocratic, because it seems to assume the totalitarian doctrine that the individual exists for the state and not the state for the individual.

Respectfully yours,
The Reconstructionist Editorial Board

A STEP TOWARD THE ABOLITION OF WAR

"GENOCIDE" is a new word in the vocabulary of our time. The practice to which it refers is not new; unfortunately, it is not obsolete either. Genocide means the systematic and deliberate obliteration of an entire group of human beings. The group may be racial, religious, cultural, economic, political; it may be characterized by long heads, red hair, or broad noses. Genocide is committed wherever any person or group of persons, or government, undertakes the avowed task of wiping out a group that it hates without any indictment against the individuals who constitute it. It is a sad commentary on our age that the UN needs to plan now ways and means of branding genocide a crime.

But apparently the horrible experience of World War II has made some impression upon the world. The extermination of six million Jews has led to the determination to interfere, if need be, in the international affairs of any nation which resorts to or tolerates mass murder. It is too early as yet to say whether or not the UN is prepared to implement its avowed sentiments regarding genocide.

There is good reason, however, to hope that such measures will be provided. For under modern conditions of life, there are powerful motivations for the enforce-

ment of laws outlawing mass murder. Life is insecure for every one as long as genocide is permitted. In the final analysis, every one belongs to *some* group. Until genocide is banned, any individual may be executed for the mere offense of belonging to a group that the government or some other group wants out of the way. The Jews who were done to death were not individually charged with any guilt. The mere fact that they were Jews was enough to legitimize their destruction. The Assyrians in Irak were massacred in the same way. The Armenians received similar treatment at the hands of the Turks.

Nothing gives more tragic evidence of the tenuous hold that ethical ideals have on our civilization than that genocide is only now beginning to be condemned as a crime subject to penalization by appropriate social agencies. In all societies, even the most primitive, murder is considered a crime. It is recognized that the murder of one member of the group by another weakens the group as a whole. Therefore the law steps in and the collective conscience of the group condemns individuals who engage in murder because of some private, personal motivation. But among primitive peoples, when the group itself has a grievance, real or imagined, against another group, it justifies and glorifies a collective assault on that group, even to the point of extermination. Thus war has been glorified by the very societies that condemn murder. For, in the last analysis, aggressive war *is* mass-murder or genocide.

When we realize this truth, we see the full significance of the move to ban genocide. That attempt is the first step in the banning of war. The conscience of humanity everywhere today condemns aggressive war as an instrument of national policy, at least in theory. But when there is a clash of national interests, the absence of world government and the consequent despair of redressing grievances by reference to an international law lead to genocidal warfare between nations. We have not yet reached the stage when nations are willing to delegate to an international authority sufficient power to deal effectively with all matters that concern the welfare of humanity as a whole. Therefore we fall back in crises on the doctrine of "national sovereignty" which makes every nation a law unto itself in respect to its dealings with other nations.

The adoption of a convention to abolish genocide by action of the United Nations will, if provision is made for its implementation, be a notable step forward in curbing the irresponsible assertion of national sovereignty. For such a convention would accord recognition to the principle that groups may not murder one another any more than individuals may, and that, if a government perpetrates or tolerates genocide, it thereby forfeits its sovereignty to the extent of justifying intervention by the United Nations.

The value of an international convention against genocide depends, however, on the adequacy of measures adopted for its implementation. If such a convention were to be adopted and not enforced, it would actually give encouragement to genocide. The failure of its enforcement would then strengthen aggressive groups in the conviction that there is no law other than the law of the jungle which they must respect. They would be confirmed in their judgment that might alone determines which group shall survive and which perish. If, however, an earnest endeavor is made to implement an anti-genocide convention, the effect will be the reverse. We must, to be sure, not expect perfect implementation from the outset. That would be utopian. But if the measures taken succeed in reducing appreciably the incidence of genocide within na-

tions, those measures will establish faith in a moral law that applies to intergroup relations as well as to relations between individuals of the same group. And, by setting the moral law in this respect above the principle of "national sovereignty," we will be making progress toward the abolition of that most destructive of all forms of genocide—war.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

THE recrudescence of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union during the war and post-war years may now be regarded as sufficiently documented to be accepted as fact, however unwelcome. Surveys such as the very significant analysis, "Has Russia Solved the Jewish Problem?", by Harry Schwartz in the February issue of *Commentary*, make it clear that hatred of Jews pervades contemporary Russian life to a degree one would have thought impossible fifteen years ago. "The Ukrainian population showed itself violently anti-Semitic after the end of the war. . . . Anti-Semitism was not confined to the Western areas . . . [but] revealed itself openly in certain circles of the Moscow intelligentsia early in the war. . . . [There has been an] increase in anti-Semitism in Kirghizia in Russian Turkestan . . . [and] among the millions in the Red Army. . . . [There is] rather impressive evidence of the continued decline of Jewish influence in the top circles of the Communist Party . . . [and] among the rising stars of Soviet political life. . . . A related phenomenon is the almost complete displacement of Jews as official representatives abroad. . . . Corroborative testimony on this point is given by reports of several American correspondents in Moscow that Jews are no longer accepted for diplomatic training in the Soviet Union. . . The upshot . . . is a substantial increase in the volume or virulence of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. . . . This writer keenly remembers the conversations he had with Soviet Jews in Berlin, officers in the Red Army, during the summer of 1945. Their words revealed the same neuroses, the same fears of anti-Semitism, and the same concern over the future of their people, as one can find analogously among Jews in the Western world. . . ."

These passages from Mr. Schwartz's article reflect a situation in the Soviet Union that should give Jews everywhere matter for serious thought. Anti-Semitism —we had been told—had finally disappeared in Russia. The sweeping economic revolution and the official outlawing of anti-Semitic propaganda had eliminated it. And many of us, even among those most critical of Russian conditions, really believed these allegations. It was something we all wanted to believe. But now the facts can no longer be denied: Anti-Semitism has broken out again in Russia. What does it mean and what conclusions can we draw from this experience?

Whatever else it may mean, it certainly spells finish to two of the most troublesome illusions of modern Jewish life: that the abolition of capitalism will bring an end to anti-Semitism and that freedom of assimilation will solve the "Jewish problem." No matter what the economic system prevailing in Russia may be, it is certainly not the capitalist system dominant in the "bourgeois democracies," which so many of us have been only too ready to blame for the evils of minority discrimination and anti-Semitism. And yet in this non-capitalist Russia, among Russian Jews, we witness "the same neuroses, the same fears, the same concern" as one finds among Jews in the capitalist world. The mere destruction of capitalism is evidently not enough.

Nor will assimilation do. Assimilation

as a social policy has been encouraged by the Soviet government from the moment it came into power. And there have been plenty of American Jews shortsighted enough to hail this policy as the road to salvation. Only three years ago, Rabbi Elmer Berger felt it possible to deliver himself of the following pronouncement:

> "If the [second] World War is not to be in vain, the last murky areas of barbarism will disappear. The last of the "Jewish problems" will be solved and the 'Lessing-Mendelssohn' process will be fully operative where it has never been tried. Russia, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia prove that it will work. 'The Jewish people' will disappear with other vestiges of ancient evil; Jews will survive as human beings, settling down to the eternal quest of all men to realize the fullest development of themselves in freedom."

It is doubtful if Rabbi Berger would be quite so positive today. The "Jewish problem" seems to be still around, even in Russia.

But what has really been happening in Russia? Undoubtedly, the economic dislocation and destruction, the immense sum of human suffering that the war brought to Russia are part of the background of the current revival of anti-Semitism. The mechanism by which mass misery and insecurity are transformed into *Judenhass* is only too well known to us. Nor can it be doubted that the "tremendous surge of Great Russian nationalism within the Soviet Union," to which Mr. Schwartz directs attention, has had its effect. Where chauvinistic nationalism is rampant in the modern world, anti-Semitism follows as a matter of course.

Yet such an analysis does not go far enough. Why should mass misery, why should nationalistic self-inflation, mean Jew-hatred? To ask this question is t see that the roots of anti-Semitism g much deeper than the relatively superf cial levels of economics and politics. The go deep into the basic institutions of so ciety, into the deep-set patterns of edu cation and family life, into the ver structure of historical human nature a it has developed in our culture, and per haps deeper yet. At any rate, we can n longer be naive enough to believe that mere change of the institutional set-u or the mere passage of a law, no matte how drastic, is enough to wipe out s inveterate an evil as anti-Semitism.

The struggle against anti-Semitism mus proceed on all levels, for on all level there are always possibilities for positiv action in achieving a better balance o justice and a greater measure of decenc in human relations. But indispensable fo even the most limited effectiveness is a realistic grasp of the depth and complex ity of the problem. A frank assessmen of what is taking place in Russia can g a long way in helping us achieve such a realistic standpoint.

REALITIES AND VALUES

On February 19, the Pales tine Government, as reported in a JTA despatch from Jerusalem, announced tha it would give $1,200,000 to the Supreme Moslem Council. This money, according to a government communiqué should have been paid in 1942.

If the government waited so long why could it not wait until peace was re stored? Why the hurry? The government explains that it is "because of the press ing needs of the Council." It does not say why the needs of the Council are so pressing, but one reason is the flight of

wealthy Arabs from the country to escape the extortions and intimidations of the same gang that runs the Supreme Moslem Council. It does not require much guessing to surmise what the Council needs the money for.

And Great Britain still keeps up the pretense of being neutral as between Arabs and Jews in Eretz Yisrael.

▼

THE HATE GROUPS KNOW WELL how to make use, in their propaganda, of slogans, cartoons and other devices for imparting suggestions to people who won't take the time to listen to an argument.

There is no reason, however, why the devil should have all the good slogans and propaganda tricks.

We are pleased, therefore, to learn that a campaign against race prejudice is about to be launched throughout the United States aided and supported by the entire advertising profession and by many business, labor and civic organizations.

It is also gratifying to learn that a memorial postage stamp will soon be issued in honor of four army chaplains—Protestant, Catholic and Jewish — who were drowned when the transport, U.S.S. Dorchester was torpedoed in the North Atlantic in 1943. This joint tribute to Chaplains George L. Fox, Clark V. Poling, John W. Washington and Alexander D. Goode will be a mute but eloquent appeal for interfaith goodwill.

▼

ASHES FROM THE OSWIECIM death camp were recently buried in Beth Zion cemetery in Buffalo, N. Y., at a ceremony participated in by fifty persons, including Rabbis J. O. Haberman and G. H. Kaprow.

The ashes were brought to this country by a Jewish refugee who had escaped from Germany to Shanghai and returned to Europe after the war in search of his parents. He found that they had met death in the Oswiecim crematorium. He then obtained permission from the authorites to remove some of the ashes for burial. The fate which his parents had suffered in common with so many others of his people he thus commemorated in an act of piety in which all the victims were memorialized.

If some of the ashes from the mass graves of our people in Europe could be buried with appropriate rites in every Jewish cemetery in America it would dramatize for us the involvement of all Jewry in one community of fate and of faith.

▼

DR. A. S. W. ROSENBACH HAS retired from the presidency of the American Jewish Historical Society after having served in that capacity for twenty-seven years.

It is good to know that the future of the organization to which he devoted so much effort has been assured by bringing it under the sponsorship of the Jewish Welfare Board. The society will retain its autonomy under the new arrangement. Lee M. Friedman, of Boston, Mass., will succeed Dr. Rosenbach as president.

The Jewish Historical Society has collected a wealth of data bearing on the contribution of Jews to American life. Now that it is becoming apparent that American Jewry is destined to be, for a long time, the principal center of Jewish life in the Diaspora, it is to be hoped that the Society will also collect ample data on the impact of American life on the Jewish community.

▼

ONE OF THE INTERESTING DEvelopments of Jewish life in America is the growing participation of the synagogue in movements for social justice.

The tendency began, as was natural,

(*Continued on Page* 21)

A Rabbi "in White"

By ISRAEL J. GERBER

The changing function of the rabbinate in America has tended to stress the pastoral care of the rabbi, his ministering to the personal religious needs of his congregation. Almost no attention to this phase of his activities, however, is reflected in present rabbinic training. Many rabbis have recently come to feel the inadequacy of their preparation in meeting situations of crisis in the lives of their congregants, and some have sought guidance in this phase of their work in non-Jewish institutions. The following is the first of two articles telling of the experience of one rabbi who took a course in the Institute of Pastoral Care at the Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston. His experience led him to conclusions that have an important bearing on the future role of the rabbi in American Jewish life. The second article by Rabbi Gerber, "Pastoral Clinical Training in Operation," will appear in our next issue. —*Editors*

I WAS a rabbi "in white" for six weeks this summer at the historic Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston. They were six of the most meaningful and profitable weeks I have spent, profitable both to my community and to myself. In fact, I am so impressed with their value that I have decided to write out my experiences so that they may stir other rabbis to undergo similar post-graduate training.

Inadequate Rabbinic Training for Pastoral Duties

When I came to my first pulpit, I found that I was prepared inadequately to meet such situations among my parishioners as serious and fatal illnesses, the loss of a limb or an organ, bereavement, and similar crises. I felt so helpless. I did not know what to do, or what to say. Yes, the *sefarim* tell us something, but that is only book knowledge, education in the abstract. In my community, however, I was facing reality, life itself, not just cold words in print.

Without a doubt, many of my colleagues feel the same inadequacy. About a week before I completed my work at the hospital, a good friend of mine, a rabbi of repute in the state of my residence, frankly admitted in the course of conversation that, although he has been in the rabbinate approximately seven or eight years longer than I have been, he is still at a loss in such situations. In this respect, we both agreed, the curricula of our rabbinical seminaries are found wanting.

The desire to serve my community well at these times, too, prompted me to take special courses and, lastly, brought me to the Institute of Pastoral Care at the Massachusetts General Hospital, where I was initiated into full-time clinical work, or, as one of my counseling professors described it, "exposure to life."

The Institute of Pastoral Care

What is the Institute of Pastoral Care? Its history begins about 1923 when Dr. Richard C. Cabot, in a lecture entitled "A Plea for a Clinical Year for Theological Students," advocated that the young men training for the clergy get actual hospital training in ministering to the sick, as does the intern. He propounded that the future ministers put their theology into actual practice by dealing directly with human beings who are in need of what they have to offer. This discourse led to the founding of a clinical training course at the Worcester State Hospital, a mental institution, in 1925, with Rev. Anton T. Boison as the director. Soon similar courses began to be offered in other hospitals.

Dr. Cabot continued with his proposal

and in 1933 called the Rev. Russell L. Dicks to Boston to develop a like program at the Massachusetts General Hospital, because he felt that a general hospital offered far better facilities for comprehensive training. These two men symbolized the meeting of physician and clergyman, as they usually do at the crises in the lives of individuals. They recognized what so many before them had refused to acknowledge, as some still refuse. Dr. Cabot and the Rev. Mr. Dicks later collaborated and wrote a book, *The Art of Ministering to the Sick,* which is a "must" on the reading list of every spiritual leader. Dr. Cabot also had sufficient foresight before his demise in 1939 to establish the Ella Lyman Cabot Trust, which has since provided for the continued support of the clinical training program of the Institute.

From this beginning, the Institute of Pastoral Care has progressed rapidly, and is widely heralded today, with clergymen from all parts of the country participating in its purposes and program. The aim of this training, as set forth in the constitution, is "to organize, develop and support a comprehensive educational and research program in the field of pastoral care, with special reference to the sick." The emphasis, however, is upon ministering to the individual. Instead of treating the person merely in terms of his difficulty, he is regarded as a complete entity, a whole human being.

We were fifteen ministers, one deaconess, and one religious education teacher taking the course at the hospital this summer. Except for the religious education teacher, we all had had many years of active ministerial community work. The Institute is non-sectarian, and is supervised by a Board of Governors composed of educators, clergymen (including a rabbi), physicians, and interested laymen.

Experience As a Volunteer Orderly

The clinical training program includes a variety of experiences for the applicant. Yes, we had to submit applications with references which were passed on by a Committee on Training before we were accepted. During the first two weeks, the mornings were spent doing volunteer orderly service. The minister sheds his clerical garments and is given a white coat with a button reading "volunteer," and is assigned to work with a regular orderly making beds, carrying breakfast trays, bathing the patients, emptying bed pans, giving back-rubs, running errands, assisting in the setting up of special equipment, and fulfilling any other needs of the bed patient. During this period, the minister taking the course is not regarded as a clergyman, but rather as an orderly's helper. It may seem ridiculous that anyone should want to do orderly service when he does not have to, especially with no war going on. However, it is an experience that no one of us would have wished to miss, for a number of reasons.

It gave us, first of all, a new understanding of the kind of life a patient lives at the hospital. We now realize, thanks to the orderly service, what it really means to be sick. As we make our hospital calls from now on, we appreciate what the patient is going through, for we were with him during his uncomfortable moments and shared his unhappy state with him. Personally, I am certain that my ministry will be that much more effective from now on.

Second, as the Rev. Rollin J. Fairbanks, the Director of the Institute, puts it: "It helps the men keep their stomachs down when confronted with unpleasant situations. It helps them acquire the humility which only menial tasks can give."

Third, it taught us why we should not make pastoral visits in the hospital at eight or nine in the morning or at certain other

times of the day. The patient, as well as others on the floor, are then quite occupied, and the patient might be caught in an embarrassing position.

Lastly, from the personal point of view, it helped give me a better disposition. We were required to begin our orderly service at seven-thirty in the morning. Many a morning I was tired and grouchy. Even rabbis get that way. But when I came into the wards, I would not display my mood and tried to appear cheerful. After two or three mornings, it became part of my make-up and there was no need of further pretense. I feel I am carrying this temperament back to my community.

As Chaplain in Training

At the end of the first two weeks, the orderly-in-training is reordained, so to speak, and becomes a chaplain-in-training. He replaces his volunteer button with a Cross or a Star of David (as in my case) and begins with his clinical training, his internship. He begins four weeks of supervised pastoral calling. Each student is assigned to visit certain patients and is required to write up his visits in detailed form. In addition to the preliminary data furnished him, he lists his plans, or what he hopes to accomplish, prior to the visit itself; his impressions of the patient as he walks over to him; and a verbatim report of the pastoral call itself with all the pauses, physical expressions, interruptions, and so on. After this, he writes out an analysis of the interview and then interprets the subject matter. He criticizes his own work, lists the diagnostic impressions, and concludes by recording what he hopes to do at the next visit.

These reports are submitted to the members of the staff,* (each week to a different reader, four in all), who make notes and write comments in the margins, and may suggest possible future action. These notes are discussed privately and at seminar sessions, and are there related to parish problems. Not only are we taught to deal effectively with the sick, but also to apply our acquired experience to those in our communities who are not confined to bed but nevertheless have problems that need attention. In working with the sick, we learn how to deal with well people too.

Prof. Paul E. Johnson, the head of the Psychology of Religion department in Boston University, has made a statement in regard to the duties we performed, which is clear and succinct. "When he (the trainee) is oriented to the clinical rules and practice, he participates in the work of the chaplain: calling on patients, listening to their confessions, understanding their distresses, sharing their suffering, affirming their insights, strengthening their faith, reading Scripture, offering prayer, administering sacraments, preparing for crises of operation or death, supporting and comforting the relatives in anxiety and sorrow, accepting the inevitable and finding peace where there was agony, resentment, or despair."

Instruction and Discussion

The lectures we attended are a most informative, educational, and revealing aspect of the clinical pastoral training. During the entire six weeks' period, in addition to the lectures by the staff members, men of the highest caliber are called in to discuss subjects of medical, social service, and psychiatric interest. Some of the men to whom we had the good fortune to listen this summer, and their topics, were: Dr. Stanley Cobb on "Depressions, Obsessions, Compulsions"; Prof. Frederick Wyatt on "Diagnostic Aids"; Dr. Paul D. White on "The Cardiac Patient"; Dr. Erich Lindeman on "Understanding Emotions"; Dr. Joseph C. Aub on "Cancer"; Prof. Paul E. Johnson on

"Psychological Aspects of Faith"; and a number of other topics and speakers. The question periods that follow add to the productivity of the lectures.

The schedule also includes observing at least one operation, seeing an anesthetic administered, attending "g r a n d rounds," and sitting in on a clinical pathological conference.

I feel that this article would not be complete without a word about the staff of the Institute. The executive director is the Rev. Rollin J. Fairbanks, who is extremely competent and well-qualified for this position. His lectures were, by the unanimous agreement of the group, the finest they had heard in the field of pastoral counseling. His associate, the Rev. James H. Burns, is likewise able and well suited for his position and did chaplaincy work before coming to the Massachusetts General Hospital. Both Mr. Fairbanks and Mr. Burns are full-time chaplains at the Massachusetts General Hospital.

Another associate director was the Rev. Henry H. Wiesbauer, the director of the Pastoral Counseling Center at St. Paul's Cathedral in Boston and the recipient of a degree in social work. He stimulated our thinking on important problems and acquainted us with the work of the social agencies and showed how the pastor can cooperate with them. The course associate, Miss Ina May Greer, is a psychologist in her own right, and possesses insights that are both remarkable and penetrating. And, last but not least, was the Rev. Robert C. Leslie, the course assistant. Mr. Leslie, at present, is conducting the Thought Control Class, initiated by Dr. Joseph Pratt, at the Boston Dispensary. As can readily be seen, the staff of the Institute of Pastoral Care contained experts in their fields who helped make the clinical training program most meaningful and instructive to the participants.

I will not pretend that I got all the answers I was looking for at the I.P.C., nor does the Institute claim such success, for every individual is a distinct problem in and by himself. But I do feel that many of my inadequacies have disappeared and whatever future problems will surely arise in my community or elsewhere, I am far better prepared to deal with them and, what is of great importance, to do so with more self-assurance. I truthfully feel that, as human problems present themselves, the opportunity to resolve them is that much higher.

A Clinical Experience in Personal Growth

My attendance at the Institute of Pastoral Care of the Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston gave me more than mere clinical training. I underwent a novel religious experience which I would like to share with the readers of this article. In addition to such benefits as humility, faithful practice, critical analysis, dynamic interpersonal association, and radical reconversion (as set forth by Prof. Paul E. Johnson in an article, "The Clinical Education of the Pastor," in the March 1947 issue of *Christian Education*), there are a number of distinct values which I gained at the Institute, that have left definite imprints "inside" of me.

I mentioned before the effect on me of the service as orderly, and of the lectures we attended. But there are many more gains of even greater worth.

During the first few days at the hospital, we were occupied with getting acqainted. On the third day, as we gradually grew more intimate, two ministers, the one from Texas and the other from Michigan, said to me that this was their first opportunity to meet with a rabbi and to mingle with him intimately—that is, to spend from eight to twelve hours a day together, five days a week, for a

period of six weeks. I immediately became aware of the great responsibility that rested upon me.

As the only Jew, I felt that the manner in which I conducted myself would affect their opinions of Jews in general. We lived together, ate together, studied together, and slept in the same building. The result was a greater understanding and regard not only between the faiths of the Jew and the Christian, but likewise among the different Christian denominations. We had our distinct theologies and our distinct beliefs, and we differed visibly in our practices. However, there was a mutual acceptance, and the feeling prevailed, after a while, that the belief of the next fellow was a pretty good one, too. This, I feel, is one of the greatest achievements of the Institute of Pastoral Care, in that it indirectly contributed to a greater regard for another's faith and belief, as well as for his religious practices, rituals, and customs.

Closely linked with this is the fellowship we enjoyed, thanks to the Institute. We were living examples of the principle of the brotherhood of man. Two specific events took place, in which I was directly involved, which further convinced me that brotherhood is not just something we read about in the newspapers, or in magazines, or in books, but a reality.

Through some misunderstanding on my part, I found myself without lodging while in Boston. During the course of conversation after one of the lectures, I happened to mention it to a group of four classmates. I was immediately invited by each one of them to share his room. After they debated the issue, one emerged the "victor." But this was not all. When I came to the "winner's" room, he insisted that I sleep in his bed while he took the studio couch, which had no linen on it. No amount of arguing could convince him to sleep in his own bed.

The second incident took place on my birthday. We were at the hospital about two weeks, when I was tendered a genuine birthday surprise party. They banded together and ordered a birthday cake with my name on it, gave me some unexpected gifts which I shall keep for a long, long time, and they even called my wife long-distance to come to the party. Unless the spirit of comradeship and fellowship was part of them, this would not have taken place. I confess I was speechless at this gesture, and I thought to myself what an even more wonderful world this could be if only there were more Christian leaders like these, with their flocks emulating their practices.

The Rev. Rollin J. Fairbanks, the Executive Director of the Institute of Pastoral Care, told me that a result of this fellowship was the request that I lecture to the group on "The Role of the Rabbi as Pastor." The many questions that were asked during the lecture bore this out and suggested a sincere desire on the part of my colleagues to understand Jewish customs and laws. From now on, the group was told, a rabbi would address future sessions. I thus have the distinction of being the first rabbi to lecture at the I.P.C.

The Value of the Hospital Chapel

Among my observations at the hospital, I saw an occurrence which convinced me of the need of a chapel within hospital walls.

We attended daily devotions at the hospital every morning with a different student chaplain of our group leading in prayer each day. Despite the fact that we came from different backgrounds, a spiritual unity prevailed throughout the devotions. They were eager for me to lead the services, so they said, for they were anxious to hear Jewish prayers, both in Hebrew and in English. But I do not

wish to refer so much to the need of a chapel for the use to which we put it, as for its benefit to those not of the staff.

One morning, a few minutes before our devotions were to begin, in walked an elderly man, a doctor, and he was supporting a young man by the hand. The young man was crying, crying bitterly, holding a handkerchief over his mouth. His wife had passed away a few minutes before. When he was at about the middle of the chapel, he sank into a chair and continued with his crying. Gradually, his cries grew fainter and fainter until he finally got up, walked over to the doctor, and they both left.

We were all touched by what we saw. We were impressed not only by the calmness and strength that this unhappy man gained in the presence of God, but by the fact that the doctor had brought him there. The so-called scientific person felt that religion had a definite role to play in the life of this man. Recounting what we witnessed, we were told that the chapel is likewise used on happy occasions. When people are given good news, they, too, make their way to the chapel to express their thanks to God.

The Need of Ministers at Hospitals

Chaplain Fairbanks, in speaking of the work of the Institute of Pastoral Care, described the value of ministers at hospitals, and said: "In dealing with acutely apprehensive patients, the minister can often help by interpreting the situation. He can be of vital assistance when a patient must be told disturbing news such as death in the family, a fire loss, the probability or necessity of an operation, etc. The clergyman can be of invaluable help to the doctor in securing consent for post mortems. Treatment of problems of conscience is essentially a pastoral responsibility and of frequent import to one's illness. Creating in depressed patients a will to live, dealing with loneliness, facing fear, correcting unhealthy religious views—all these constitute some of the areas in which such a training program can make a vital contribution to a hospital."

Furthermore, the Massachusetts General Hospital is a great scientific institution, one of the oldest in the country, with a glorious history and an admirable record of achievement. Ether was first administered as an anesthetic within its portals one hundred and one years ago. Yet, it recognizes the need of a chapel and allows full-time chaplains within its midst. Indeed, it is a truly progressive hospital, caring for its patients both physically and spiritually. Unfortunately, I do not know of one Jewish-sponsored hospital that can boast of a chapel and a full-time chaplain.

While on the subject of chaplains, I would like to say that the recommendation of *The Jewish Community Bulletin* of San Francisco, that a rabbi-chaplain be appointed for the hospitals of that city, is a good suggestion. The need is great, and fully engaged rabbis have not the time to devote to the spirtual needs and wants of the patients. This is true, not only in San Francisco, but in every large city. I am not acquainted with the number of hospitals in the city of San Francisco, but I would say that this splendid project will not meet the need if the chosen chaplain has too many hospitals under his pastoral care. It would, however, be better than nothing.

From the personal angle, the Institute afforded me the opportunity to participate in a necessary and wholesome project. The residents of Boston and its environs, are aware of the existence of a Pastoral Counseling Center at St. Paul's Cathedral in Boston which is available to everyone, regardless of faith, who has a

problem he would like to discuss or who would just like to talk to someone. A pew is set aside in the rear of the church, referred to as the counseling pew, which is occupied by a counselor at certain hours of the day, for those who wish to come in without making a previous appointment. My interests are taking me more and more into the field of counseling, and the Rev. Henry H. Wiesbauer, the Director of the Pastoral Counseling Center, gave me the opportunity to occupy the counseling pew.

The value of this project has so impressed me, that I am working on the establishment of a Pastoral Counseling Center in my own community, for the community-at-large. Space has already been obtained, and a Pastoral Counseling Center shall, I hope, become a reality in Fitchburg in the not too distant future.

Some General Recommendations

The Jewish theological academies stress pastoral work very little, or not at all, in the training of the future rabbi. Pastoral work is very necessary in the functions of spiritual leaders. I feel that every rabbi should be required to visit all people in his community whether they are ill or well, and not merely socially. Visiting, although of some value by itself, is not enough. It could be utilized to better advantage if the rabbi were trained to understand where trouble is brewing and thus do preventive work. I feel that by "ringing doorbells," by being more of the pastor ministering to his flock, the rabbi can be of greater help to his community. But first and foremost, to do effective work he must be trained, with such training given to him before he departs from the seminary.

I strongly advocate that every practicing rabbi, regardless of his denomination, should undergo clinical pastoral training under able leadership, under conditions similar to those at the Institute of Pastoral Care of the Massachusetts General Hospital. I feel certain he will not regret it. Opportunity should also be made available to him for further study in this field by returning for special seminars, enabling him to transfer the knowledge gathered to the community in which he is serving.

Who shall sponsor such a program? I think that a combination of the various rabbinical groups or seminaries can do so, as four different Christian theological schools have banded together in helping sponsor the Institute of Pastoral Care at the Massachusetts General Hospital.

Until such time comes, however, I urge my colleagues to enroll for clinical pastoral training with the Institute of Pastoral Care. Such training will enable our rabbis to take on greater meaning and to be of more practical help in their parishes. Pastoral calling speaks for itself. It says very forcibly to the parishioner, "The rabbi cares, the syngagogue cares, and God cares."

When Should the Torah Be Read in the Synagogue?

By MAX WEINE

THE custom of reading the Torah on Monday and Thursday mornings was instituted by Ezra, obviously to meet a pressing need in his time. "And they went three days in the wilderness and found no water" (*Ex.* 15:33) is interpreted by the rabbis as indicating that we should not permit more than three days to elapse without a public reading of the Torah, which is compared

to water. The choice of Monday and Thursday as days for the reading of the Torah was probably guided by the fact that they were the official market days in ancient Israel. The farmers gathered into the town to do their marketing and, in the leisurely life of those days, also found time to pray and to attend to many community as well as personal affairs. A number of other religious practices such as praying for rain in time of drought, were reserved for those days. Services were undoubtedly very well attended, and provided a fit occasion for introducing the reading of the Torah. Thus, by reading the Torah on Saturday, Monday and Thursday at public services in the synagogue, the vigor and continuity of Jewish life were maintained.

The Waning Numbers That Hear the Torah Read

What Ezra and the prophets enacted in those days sheds light on how to meet a similar problem at the present time. The institution of Monday and Thursday reading of the Torah, so beneficial over a period of hundreds of years, is unfortunately fast becoming obsolete. With the problem of maintaining a daily morning service becoming increasingly difficult if not impossible, in the average American Jewish community, neither organized prayer nor the reading of the Torah is possible except from week-end to week-end. Only the Sabbath services remain the ones that can draw an attendance. Of the three Sabbath services, the Sabbath morning and afternoon services are the only ones that include the reading of the Torah. These are the most poorly attended. The Friday night services, which draw the largest crowds, lack this important feature of a synagogue service. The result is that the average American Jew who attends Friday night services faithfully and can attend others only on rare and special occasions misses this important feature in Jewish life almost completely. We are raising a generation of Jews who hardly even know what the text of the Sefer Torah looks like, to whom it is becoming a fetish, a mysterious object of devotion rather than an open book of wisdom and inspiration.

The Example Set by Ezra and His Contemporaries

Following the example set by Ezra and the prophets in the beginning of the Second Temple period, I am bold enough to suggest meeting the problem of today along the same lines as were used then. This suggestion is not original in all of its features. In part it has been tried before. But the suggestion should be discussed, and may perhaps be found practical.

Just as, in ancient times, the market days were made the occasion for a full service including the reading of the Torah because these services drew the largest attendance, so in our day every well-attended service should be made to include the reading of the Torah. I say "every" service because the total number of services has been so extremely reduced by circumstances that we should not permit any opportunity for the public reading of the Torah to go by without utilizing it.

The Reading of the Torah at Friday Night Services

My suggestion refers particularly to the Friday evening services. Certainly there is no law against reading the Torah on Friday night. The services on those evenings are the best attended in the week, and in many communities are the only ones. Not to include the reading of the Torah at those services would be to go contrary to the spirit of Jewish life as it centers around the study of the Torah.

I would not, however, read the complete weekly portion on Friday evening, both because that would prolong the reading unduly and because it is desirable to differentiate the reading on Friday night from the Saturday morning reading, the central position of which I have not the slightest intention to challenge. The rabbi on Friday night would have the choice of reading, as is the custom on Mondays and Thursdays, the first part of the weekly portion, or of selecting from that portion any part that is pertinent to his sermon or the theme of the particular Sabbath.

Reading from the Bible at Sunday Morning Services

Another service that can be developed with the reading of the Torah as part of it is a Sunday morning service. May I say, at the outset, I have not the slightest intention of setting up anything that might challenge the traditional Sabbath morning service. The Sabbath, as the pivotal institution in Jewish religious life, must be preserved at all costs. We must do everything we can do to develop a modern intelligible, and inspiring Sabbath morning service. Even if the congregation will consist largely of women and children, it would still be essentially worth while.

My proposal is to utilize the free time that most of our men have on Sunday mornings for the purpose of worship. This period of worship should be a week-day service, and should be combined with an educational program. At the basis of this program should be a regular reading from the Bible. I say "Bible" advisedly, because I feel that, in the first place, we should on that day not read the Torah from the scroll so as not to give the Sunday morning service too festive a character, and that, secondly, we should not limit the reading to the *Pentateuch*. The entire Bible should be utilized, and the reading should consist of a planned course of readings from Scripture, and lectures and discussions on the portions read. The rabbi's sermon should on that day also be more in the form of a lecture, informative rather than inspirational, and the lectures should be unit courses, dealing with Bible, history, religion, or any other aspect of Jewish life and culture.

A service of this sort, with other features of a service, such as the singing of liturgical or folk melodies, can fill a growing gap in the religious life of the average American Jew. At the present time he frequently has no feeling for the Sabbath or may not even know what a Sabbath service is like. Even the usual type of Friday night service does not fill this gap. His week-day life allows little opportunity for adult Jewish education. Very often he is entirely cut off from the synagogue and what it can offer.

We have been struggling, in the fluid state of Jewish life in this country, with forms that have become hardened with the passing of time, that have, to some extent, outlived their usefulness. It is time we tried to create new forms that might meet our needs, forms that our ancient rabbis might have created and did actually create for their own day. The reading of the Torah on Friday evening, and the development of a fine and informative week-day service on Sunday morning not only will not challenge the traditional Sabbath observance and service, but might create sufficient knowledge and interest to enable the average American Jew to put a higher value on the Sabbath and Judaism in general. It might even lead him to the point where he might succeed in finding a solution for the problem of Sabbath observance in this country. Where there is interest there is will, and where there is a will, there is a way.

Book Notes

A FALSE PORTRAIT: THE JEW IN FICTION

THE Jew in American fiction has never enjoyed a more dominating role than he does today. Wihout exaggeration it can be said that practically every week of the year there is published in the United States at least one novel which deals exclusively with the Jew as an individual, as a problem, as a victim of anti-Semitism, as a hero, or as a variety of problems interesting enough so that a plot of a novel can be hung on to them. In many other novels Jews appear as minor characters so that the authors may avail themselves of the opportunity to reflect on the Jew as a Jew.

Of course, whenever a novelist discusses the Jew, he is *for* the Jew. All the novelists are against anti-Semitism just as Calvin Coolidge was against sin. As most of the books dealing with Jews (and most of the scenes concerned with Jews in books which are not primarily about Jews) are concerned with anti-Semitism, the novelists discover an opportunity to reveal their tolerance and their understanding that the Jew is as good an American as any other in this country.

The thesis of this brief essay is that the Jew as portrayed in current American fiction is never a positive Jew, is usually a Jew seeking to be assimilated in American life so completely as to lose all attributes of Jewishness, is often a marginal Jew at best, and, at worst, is a Jew-hating Jew, along the lines of a less extreme Otto Weininger.

In other words, the Jew as portrayed by novelists during the past few years, is not a real Jew but only a stereotype of what Gentile writers think a Jew is, or what Jewish writers want a Jew to be. Unhappily, Gentile writers, good though their intentions are, usually know only the marginal or self-hating Jews. Jewish writers deal most often with Jewish issues only from the vantage point of the theme of anti-Semitism. Busy penning their apologetics, they seldom ask themselves—in print at least—what makes Jews satisfied that they are Jews. Or, putting it another way, "How do millions of Jews adjust themselves to American life without loss, or without willingness to lose their identity as Jews?"

It is undoubtedly true that a great number of Jews in America are unhappy with their status. They are discriminated against; they feel themselves considered strangers in the midst of Americans; they are unsure of their own Judaism and, as a result, seek ways out of the Jewish fold. They change their names; they give "fancy" Anglo-Saxon names to their children. They never attach themselves to a synagogue or Jewish center. They are indifferent to Jewish problems, although they think of themselves as tolerant people. To prove it, they fight for the Negro, the Mexican and the Nisei.

Yet there are literally millions of Jews who accept the fact that they were born in Judaism and that they "belong" to the Jewish people. Harrison Smith, in a fine editorial in a recent issue of the *Saturday Review of Literature,* has written: "For the truth is that most Jews want and should want to be considered as Jews, and the rest of us should not be willing to have the special qualities that this astonishing people have brought to our civilization merged and lost." At least half-a-million Jews in America have aligned themselves with organized Zionist

groups. At least a million must be connected with synagogues or Jewish centers. Thousands more belong to fraternal groups like the B'nai B'rith or to defense organizations like the American Jewish Congress. These Jews, all of them, are conscious of being Jewish.

What of the Jews as they appear in current novels? Here is a necessarily brief review of recent books dealing with Jews.

"Gentleman's Agreement" is too well known to discuss its plot. The story, however, is told from a non-Jewish point of view and deals exclusively with the effect of social anti-Semitism. There isn't a single Jew in the book who is glad he is a Jew. There isn't a Jew in the novel who is different from non-Jews in any way, except that he bears the label "Jew" and is unhappy about it. Not a Jew in the book has any feeling for Jewish religion or for Zionism. Not a Jew seems to know anything about being a Jew, except that he suffers social discrimination.

"Focus" by Arthur Miller is the tale of a Christian mistaken for a Jew. In the story there is drawn the portrait of a courageous Jewish newspaper dealer who bears his "burden" bravely. Why? No answer is given.

"Wasteland" by Jo Sinclair is the story of a Jew who hated himself, who hated the idea of being Jewish. He is cured by psychiatry, but, in the meanwhile, the author manages to portray a group of Jews all of whom hate themselves for having been born Jews. It is a miserable picture.

"Home Is the Hunted" by Abraham Bernstein concerns a Jew who tries to "pass" as a Christian, much in the same manner that light-skinned Negroes sometimes try to "pass" as whites. The overall effect of this novel is that it appears to be a study in self-hate. The author offers no solution; he merely catalogues the reasons for the Jew's changing his name from Cohen to Cannaday.

Acclaimed by *Time* magazine as the most intelligent book dealing with the Jewish problem during the past twelve months, "The Victim" by Saul Bellow is an interesting work of art. Its hero, Asa Leventhal, is an insecure Jew, with a guilt complex because he doesn't "belong" to the society in which he lives. The portrayal is a valid one and it has its compassion, but nowhere is there any clarification, let alone emphasis, on the positive aspects of being a Jew. It should be stressed here that I am not dealing with these novels as works of art. Many of them are readable books, and some of them are well worth reading. Mr. Bellow's novel in particular is one to be studied carefully. Nevertheless, the subject at hand forces the critic to state that all the Jewish characters mentioned in these novels are marginal Jews, bitter that they must suffer because they are Jews, when in reality they wish to God they were never born into the Jewish faith. Waldo Frank once wrote that the tragedy is that many people are persecuted for being Jews when actually they are Jewish only through the accident of birth.

The novels thus far discussed were written by Jews, yet in none of their pages is there one inkling that there is a happy Jew in America, one who is *glad* of his Jewishness, or at least as glad of it as an Irishman is over his Celtic blood.

Even more depressing is the picture of the Jew as drawn by non-Jewish novelists. In "Alexandra" by Gladys Schmitt, the narrator of the story is a Jewish woman named Sophie Littman, who says at the outset, "I am—and I state it here because I sense that it is a vital factor in the story—a stranger born within the gates, a Jew." But the fact that Sophie is Jewish means nothing. She could just as easily have been an Armenian. Emmanuel Saltzman, a Jewish character in the book, "directed a negative snobbish-

ness against his derivation and my own." Emmanuel's mother is hardly a likeable person.

Robert McLaughlin's "The Side of the Angels" deals with two Irish brothers, one a liberal, the other a Fascist, and a love affair between Tom Egan, the liberal, and Rhodia Martin, a Jewish girl. Yet Rhodia is hardly a Jewess. She has never gone with Jewish boys, because, as she flippantly but probably truthfully tells it, "I was anti-Semitic, of course." Tom believes that the Jews will assimilate, and to him that is a fine thing. There is no cognizance of the Jew being a person who believes in his own religion, in his own heritage. Rhodia is made to say that her family is Zionistic "I think from a confused feeling that if they can get rid of what they consider undesirable Jews, they'll be accepted." Rhodia, in the final analysis, marries an Irishman without a single compunction and her entire environment is completely non-Jewish. Nevertheless, she is presented as the "Jewish angle" in a well-intended novel by a penetrating writer.

There are other novels, like Frederic Wakeman's "The Saxon Charm," which is about an aggressive, hated figure of a man, who is a Jew, not unlike Sammy Glick in Budd Schulberg's masterly "What Makes Sammy Run?" Many other novels contain a token Jew, in order to serve as a sounding board for the novelist's liberal ideas. But none of the Jews are really Jewish. Most of them have Jewish names. They are discriminated against—as many Jews are. But a stereotype has developed. Here is the Jew as developed by the many novelists writing about Jews:

He is an intelligent, sophisticated person, well-educated, a writer or an artist of some kind. He moves easily among non-Jews. He is accepted, except, of course, for some social bias. He never attaches himself to a Jewish cause and never has anything to do with organized Jewish life, either communal or religious. His wife is often a Gentile, but if she is Jewish, she is highly assimilated. Both are fairly promiscuous and seem to have nothing to do with their own parents. They are completely cut away from their youthful backgrounds.

If the Jew in the book is a woman, she is involved with many men, most of whom are Christians. She is a highly desired woman who hasn't the slightest notion of Jewish history, Jewish life or Jewish values. Being intelligent, she seldom denies that she is Jewish but never makes a practise of announcing it and generally gets away with the impression that she is Christian. Somewhere in the story, however, the Jew or the Jewess, is made to feel uncomfortable because, after all, Jews don't belong.

Do you know many such Jews? Are you one? I doubt it.

HAROLD U. RIBALOW

REALITIES AND VALUES

(*Continued from Page* 9)

with the rabbinate. Rabbinic bodies would make pronouncements on social justice at their conventions.

These rabbinic statements, however, had little effect on the attitudes of the laity.

But recently, both in the Reform and the Conservative movement, the congregational unions, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the United Synagogue of America, have joined with their respective rabbinical associations, the Central Conference of American Rabbis and the Rabbinical Assembly of America, to establish commissions on social justice. These commissions should serve to activate the congregations to take a stand on social issues.

Random Thoughts

If you want to succeed as a prophet, prophesy evil.

* * *

Only those who think let think.

* * *

To think is to argue with oneself.

Most people don't like to get into any arguments.

That is why they hate to think.

Besides, the less you think the more likely you are to be classed with the "right-thinking" people.

* * *

Cicero started the idea that those who needed religion were mainly the ignorant.

The Jewish Sages taught that an ignorant person could not be truly religious.

* * *

It takes two to make one of them a hypocrite.

* * *

A Tennessee preacher is said to have smashed his time piece when the Federal Government finally instituted four kinds of standard time: Eastern, Central, Mountain and Pacific.

Those who object to having changes in religious and ethical standards reflect changes in conditions of life belong to the same tribe as that preacher.

* * *

Whatever makes our neighbors Jew-conscious makes us Jews painfully self-conscious.

* * *

Such short cuts to learning as fifteen minutes a day of aimless and undirected reading among great books, or passive attendance at lectures on all kinds of subjects, are invitations to ignorance.

* * *

The reluctance to face realities is a far greater ethical sin than the refusal to believe in miracles could ever have been a religious sin.

* * *

The sneezing caused by the dusting off of forgotten philosophers is no proof of their reinstatement in men's thinking.

* * *

It appears that statesmen have a vested interest in international quarrels; otherwise they could not be adept at exacerbating them.

* * *

Every act of freedom is an affirmation of "Nevertheless."

* * *

Envy not the man in an official role;
Seldom does he get a chance to own his soul.

* * *

Is there no third alternative to billing and cooing at Good Will meetings than killing and booing in the great world outside?

* * *

The Southern Democrats have discovered a way of keeping the Civil War fresh. They wage it cold.

* * *

One of the main difficulties in attempting to raise the standard of education is the facts that those whose support is essential were brought up on a substandard education and ascribe to it the success they have attained.

* * *

"Falling out of love with parents is the first step toward falling in love with a mate and beginning a new family." (John Levy and Ruth Monroe in *The Happy Family.*)

That is said much better in Genesis:

"This is why a man leaves his father

and mother and cleaves to his wife, till they become one flesh."

* * *

Like everything else in the world, human nature is neither what it is nor what it can be; it is both.

* * *

Viewed scientifically, a human being is a machine to convert matter into energy.

Viewed commercially, a hog is a machine to convert wheat into meat, and a human being is a hog to boost the price of both.

* * *

Our sophisticated youngsters have a less stuffy way of minimizing all values than by repeating Koheleth's slogan of "vanity of vanities."

All they need say is: So what?

M. M. K.

Correspondence

In Response to Our Criticism of the American Council for Judaism*

I have read, and am appalled by the editorial in the Reconstructionist of February 6th dealing with the recent convention of the American Council for Judaism. I have long since become accustomed to distortion and misrepresentation on the part of the official Zionist press and its satellites throughout the country. It is with infinite sorrow that I see the same smear tactics used by your publication.

Perhaps in utmost fairness to your readers, as well as to the organization you have maligned, you would consider publishing in full the talk that I gave at St. Louis, a copy of which I am enclosing.

In any event, I hope that you are not so far gone in partisanship as to deny me space in your magazine to comment on the potpourri of malice that you have heaped upon us:

1) In the main, your editorial is based on excerpts of the talks given at our convention and which you contend anti-Semites might lift out of context as you have done. I submit, however, that such a practice sets up a dangerous criterion for public debate on public issues. I dare say that there are innumerable quotations from your own publication and from your other writings that, similarly taken out of context, might be useful to the anti-Semite. To proceed by that fear is, in the end, to stifle all discussion.

You refer in your editorial to the Hebrew prophets. They did criticize Jewish leaders of their times, and, by their prophetic insight, all reprehensible actions of Jews. Lifted out of context, many of their excoriations are grist for the mill of the Jew-hater. Were they, by your lights, guilty of "defamation" of Jews? Would you have silenced the prophets?

We ought to take to heart a lesson of recent history. Whenever the late Mr. Chamberlain, Prime Minister of England, was criticized in Parliament for his disastrous policies, his favorite retort was to denounce his critics as "befouling their own nest." With that charge he tried to stifle legitimate criticisms of his policies. I maintain that this is not a tactic to be followed by those who believe in freedom of discussion. If anything, your voice should be raised against such vicious practice.

2) In your comment on President Truman's statement to the Council you divert into a presumed, if inaccurate, statement of basic Council views. The artificial nationalism of Zionism is only one aspect of our opposition to it. The other is its implied co-mingling of national interests—and that is a subject on which your editorial entirely avoids comment. Is it your contention that "in our national loyalty and interests" Americans should think and act otherwise than exclusively as Americans? If you do, say so clearly. If you really believe that, then make the point that Americans of various national origins and differing religious associations should qualify their exclusive national loyalty to this country with another to some other country. If you do not, then I suggest you indicate clearly your approval of the position we take.

3) Let me here point out that to think and to act exclusively as Americans is by no means to maintain that this view should be a narrow one. On the contrary, it is precisely because of my devotion to America that I believe that it must take its place fully and properly in an international organization for peace, and that it must extend the most generous aid to other countries. To think and to act in my national identity as an American does not mean

* For our reply to this letter read our editorial, "An Open Letter to Mr. Rosenwald."

that I must be unaware of the interdependence of the entire world.

4) You quote part of my statement about the effect of Jewish nationalism in England and then make an utterly erroneous implication. I neither said nor implied that Jews who are citizens of England should not freely express their opinions. All citizens of all nations should have the right to express their views on governmental policy, while it is in the making and even after it has been made. There is nothing eternal or fixed about governmental policy. This, however, is a far cry indeed from having any group within a country embark on its own independent foreign policy which is at variance with or even hostile to the agreed-upon policy of their government.

5) You convey the same false imputation in regard to the Council's position as to American Jews. We would not deny any American citizen the right to disagree with our government's foreign policy. We believe that those of us who feel that way should be free to condemn the United States' policy in support of partition, just as others should be free to condemn the United States' policy on the embargo of arms to the Near East. It is utterly false to charge us with the contention that any American should be other than completely free to approve or criticize policies of our government. But with equal emphasis I must state our view that no individual or group in America is free to carry on, in the international political field, independent negotiations and activities.

6) You make a bare, passing reference to my comment on the Jews in the Arab countries. The point of what I said was very simply that more and more there is a growing realization of the consequences of Zionist political activity on close to a million Jews in the Arab countries. Whenever in the past we had pointed to this likelihood as a proper concern of Jewish leadership, we were howled down with abuse similar to that of your editorial. Only now is the grim fact emerging that as against *possible* improvement of the lot of 600,000 Jews in Palestine, there is an actual grave deterioration of the condition of nearly 1,000,000 Jews in the Near East countries. We know they are victims. As to the cause of their plight, there is not a competent reporter who does not agree that this deterioration is due to the Zionist political activities of the last ten years. Seek out the culprit and you shall find him.

7) Neither Carroll Binder nor Dr. Paul Hutchinson needs defense from me. Their long record as upright, honorable men of profound moral opinions and with deep concern for Jews, speaks for itself.

I shall make only a few observations on that part of your editorial. In the main, I contend that what is of great significance is not only what is said *about* Jews but also what is done *by* Jews. Rightly Jews can be indignant about false and lying statements made by bigots and hatemongers. On the other hand, Jews are not a supine, static group. They have the ability to contribute, by their own actions, a favorable atmosphere or one which can antagonize otherwise liberal and sympathetic people.

I want to express my most earnest warning that no greater injury can be done to Jews than to identify as anti-Semites those non-Jews who are conscientious opponents of Zionism.

Certainly, it must be clearly understood now that, to the extent that there will be a Zionist state with its own international program, its policies are certain to lead to a division of United States opinion. A Zionist state will have its normal part to play in the international political tug of war. It must learn to accept, without whimpering, friendship or hostility on the part of other nations depending upon their differing national interests. To make political opposition to the policies of a Zionist state the basis of a claim of anti-Semitism is to undermine the position of Jews throughout the world. There is no quicker or more certain way to produce large masses of anti-Semites.

8) Your readers may disagree with the views of the American Council for Judaism (although I am not sure that they know these views in the original language, free from the distortions that the Jewish press has given). But surely your readers must realize that we are trying to come to grips with a fundamental problem which cannot be wished out of existence. More than one Zionist recognizes the existence of that problem. As an instance, Dr. Trude Weiss-Rosmarin has written recently:

"There was then, as there is now, the all-important matter of reconciling the 'loyalty' to the Jewish Homeland with allegiance to the country of one's birth."

More recently, Max Lerner was reported in the press to have made a public address referring to another aspect of the same problem, in which he "warned American Jewry, if it does not want to be accused of dual loyalty, to stay out of the internal politics of the Jewish State in Palestine."

We are engaged in the process of discovering what reconciliation is possible. That ought to be your concern as well. Certainly it is not a subject to be brushed aside.

I believe that, upon reflection, most American Jews will conclude that the soundest formula for reconciliation is to be found in the relationship implicit in our phrase: "Americans of Jewish faith."

Sincerely yours,

LESSING J. ROSENWALD, *President*
The American Council for Judaism